DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 063 CS 205 784

AUTHOR Thomas, Susan: Watson, Patti
TITLE Critical Competitors. Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project. Technical Report.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 38p.: For related documents see CS 205 779-786.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Analysis: Elementary Secondary Education: Higher Education: *Inservice Teacher Education: *Program Content: Program Descriptions: *Program Effectiveness: *Program Evaluation: *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Bay Area Writing Project

ABSTRACT

Prepared as part of the evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP), this report compares BAWP to its "critical competitors" (other inservice teacher programs and programs for improving student writing). The BAWP model and ten other program descriptions are presented in identical descriptive formats. Three types of competitors are described, including composition inservice programs, other inservice programs, and composition programs. The descriptive format used to make comparisons offers information on each program's scope, content, process, the monitoring of program implementation, and the reported effectiveness of the program (impact on participants/students, long term followup materials, and projected costs). The concluding section of the report provides comparisons of the programs and recommendations for changes and improvements in the BAWP model. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191063

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATION OF THE BAY AREA WRITING PROJECT

A Technical Report

Funded By
The Carnegie Corporation

1979

Evaluation Directed by
Michael Scriven
Director, Evaluation Institute
University of San Francisco
San Francisco, CA 94117

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael Scriven

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS205784

This report represents only ONE component of the total Evaluation of the Bay Area Writing Project. The other Evaluation reports are available through the BAWP office. For an up-to-date list, including current prices, write

James R. Gray, Director
Bay Area Writing Project
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

CRITICAL COMPETITORS

by

Susan Thomas and Patti Watson

BAWP Evaluation

September 1979

CRITICAL COMPETITORS REPORT

ABSTRACT

Overview

A variety of secondary sources were surveyed to identify "critical competitors" or programs which offered any services comparable to BAWP's. Several of the most promising were selected for in-depth description and comparison to the basic BAWP Invitational-Inservice model. It is worth noting that almost no critical competitors could be found in the field of composition inservice and that many of the competitors discussed here were drawn from other curriculum areas.

Findings and Conclusions

1. Scope: In terms of numbers reached and geographical areas covered, BAWP outshines its competitors in the extent of its dissemination through the local programs and the National Writing Project (its offshoot). That it continues to add programs and affiliated sites after six years of operation also makes it unique among its competitors.

2. Content: BAWP has made some innovative contributions to the content of inservice training for composition teachers, particularly by identifying and modelling promising practices in composition, by continuing to update program offerings, and by requiring teachers to write. It has focused on what individual teachers might do in their own classrooms rather than on tactics for effecting larger program changes at the school or district level. Although the flexibility and openness of BAWP content seem to be the basis for its continuing popularity among teachers, it is difficult to measure the impact on students, teachers, and programs, when these impacts may be so different in kind from person to person or place to place. It is also difficult to define which aspects of the inservices are actually responsible for changes in student or teacher performance.

3. Process: BAWP appears to be an extremely effective model for developing new inservice leaders and presentors, incorporating critical competitors, and encouraging school-university collaboration. Its success comes at a time of great need for composition inservice, caused by inadequate training of most English instructors in teaching of composition and the general lack of inservice training in teaching composition.

4. Monitoring program implementation: Many of the critical competitors are more active than BAWP in observing teachers in the classroom and helping them revise their instructional techniques. Because of financial limitations, BAWP has provided very few services in this area to date.

5. Reported Effectiveness: BAWP's ambitious program goals make it virtually unique compared to its critical competitors. Because less ambitious competitors offering inservice to composition teachers report measurable student impact, they carry an appeal which BAWP does not have at present, in part because of inadequate measurement of student gains. With regard to reported teacher impact, however, BAWP achieves as good or better ratings as any of its competitors.

Recommendations

1. BAWP might benefit from examining some of the observation procedures used by other inservice models to monitor classroom implementation of training, to refine presented techniques, and to develop a broader base of support for program change following the inservice. (See p. 34 for a more specific list of these procedures.)

2. In order to extend the effect of its inservice training, BAWP needs to include presentations on instituting program change within its inservice package, and to encourage participants to spend some time during inservice meetings discussing possibilities for program change. It might also consider special institutes held for school administrators, designed to persuade them of the need for system-wide change in composition programs to bring improvement in student writing skills.

3. BAWP needs to develop strong student evaluation designs to remain competitive with other composition programs. It also needs to consider designing methods for measuring the impact of its diverse program offerings or to amend its program content so that its effects would be more measurable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract of Conclusions 1

A. Purposes and limitations of the study 1

B. The BAWP Model 5

C. Inservice Teacher Training

1. Composition Inservices 8

a. Huntington Beach 9

b. Fairfax Expressive Writing Project 11

2. Other Inservices 14

a. Minicourse: Microteaching 15

b. Individualized Instruction 17

c. Interactive Television 19

d. Dissemination Model for Elementary Science 20

e. Motor Education for the Handicapped 22

f. Inservice Program for Earth Science Teachers 24

D. Composition Programs 26

1. Anne Obenchain's, Links to Forceful Writing 27

2. Vista Writing Program 28

E. Conclusion 29

A. PURPOSES AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

The following report describes programs or organizations which provide services which can be compared in general function to those offered by the Bay Area Writing Project (BAWP). Such programs may be called "critical competitors" of the writing project model, since they are the alternative options for an adopter. They allow us to look with a more critical understanding at the way other agencies solve problems addressed by BAWP. And a study of "critical competitors" may also provide a clearer sense of the educational context within which BAWP operates, BAWP's achievements within that context, and possibilities for further achievement or different approaches BAWP may wish to consider in its future development.

These investigations, in fact, parallel those which were active influences in the development of the writing project. When designing the original model (described below), BAWP leaders built upon knowledge of the successes and failures of past inservice experiences. BAWP itself, then, stands as a major critical competitor of past and present programs for training teachers and improving writing instruction. (In certain respects it continues to appear as the most successful model of English curriculum inservice currently available). It is in the interest of understanding the significance of the BAWP model as well as of supporting further refinements of that model that we offer the following comparative descriptions. To do so, we have analyzed three types of critical competitors:

1. Programs/projects/individuals providing systems for improving the writing performance of students.
2. Inservice training programs from other subject areas.
3. Inservice training programs specifically for teachers of writing.

Included in this final report are only those programs which have been in operation for at least one year, which have been evaluated with some report of observed effects, and which have at least one feature different from the BAWP model but relevant to achieving its purposes.

The present report does not include information about BAWP's offshoots, the National Writing Project sites. Although each of these sites has utilized the BAWP model, many of them have made additions or alterations to it. In some cases the suggestions made here may have already been effected at a national site. If this is found to be the case, it will further attest to the flexibility and vitality of the writing project model.

Sources which were consulted for the final report include:

a) all ERIC reports, 1966-79, using the descriptors "inservice-evaluation, writing-inservice, writing-evaluation,"

b) Professional conferences including CATE (California Association of Teachers of English), NCTE (National Council of Teachers of English), CCTE (Canadian Council of Teachers of English),

c) experts in the field of inservice training and evaluation

d) review of professional journals

e) survey of all California State College, State University writing programs and University of California writing programs conducted by TIES (Teaching, Innovation, Evaluation Services) at UC Berkeley,

f) Carlton University faculty (Ottawa, Canada) who recently completed a two year study for the Ontario Department of Education on preparation of composition teachers and promising practices in the field of composition.

To allow ease of comparison of the different models a standard descriptive format will be used throughout this report. Each critical

competitor along with the BAWP model will be described with respect to five categories. Because of space limitations an effort has been made to include only that information useful for general descriptive purposes or related to BAWP's model. Specific comparisons of these projects to BAWP are included throughout the program descriptions. Descriptive categories include:

-scope: both the size of the project (number of participants, students served, etc.) as well as the ultimate number of people reached by the project and the geographical areas covered

-content: type of training and type of content (knowledge, attitudes, behaviors or some combination of them)

-process: the duration of the project and the training procedure

-follow-up: any measures used after initial presentation of techniques and/or information to monitor and amend participants' behavior and/or knowledge (including classroom observation, consultation with trainers, etc.)

-reported effectiveness: information about impact on participants, impact on students, long-term follow-up, cost, and other evaluation data.

A major limitation on the entire discussion that follows is that all information on critical competitors is taken from evaluation reports. In no case has it been possible to interview or observe project participants or to check the reported evaluation data for completeness, accuracy, and appropriateness.

B. THE BAWP MODEL

I. BAY AREA WRITING PROJECT U.C. BERKELEY

II. SCOPE

A. Local programs: standard inservice dissemination model
   1. Summer Invitational: 152 participants (1974-1979)
   2. School year inservices: highest involvement was during the 1977-78 school year (estimated at 800 participants); since the passage of Proposition 13, the average number of participants within a year has dropped only slightly with a total of 33 programs seen (estimated 600 participants).

B. Other locally administered programs
   1. Open Program (estimated 400 participants)
   2. Subject A training program (estimated 125 participants)
   3. Pre-service program (estimated 70 participants, 1978-79)
   4. Other summer programs: Partnership Program, Department of Defense summer program (England, Tokyo and Singapore), Virgin Islands-Title IVC Program

C. National programs: 1976-1979
   1. California Writing Project
   2. National Writing Project

D. Continued growth: BAWP is still increasing its number of affiliated sites and inservice program offerings at the end of its sixth year.

III. CONTENT: BAWP attempts to improve teaching performance by changing teachers' knowledge of theories and techniques, and, in the process, their attitudes toward writing instruction and their classroom behaviors. This is accomplished in courses utilizing demonstrations and discussion of writing techniques, modelling of desired teaching behaviors, and experimental learning (teachers write and give peer feedback).

IV. PROCESS: Standard inservice dissemination model

A. Summer Invitational: Twenty-five teachers who have been identified (through interviews and recommendations) as outstanding teachers of composition are invited to a five-week intensive training program. This experience enables them to become Teacher Consultants (i.e. presentors at inservice meetings) and coordinators of the subsequent school year inservices. The learning process is termed as "participatory" because teachers experience what they in turn will use with their students and with teachers in inservices.
   1. Participants give presentations on a method or approach for teaching composition. This presentation usually becomes the basis for each teacher's later contribution at a school inservice. These presentations are discussed and evaluated by participants and staff.
   2. Teachers do writing assignments in small groups.
   3. Teachers meet twice weekly in writing-editing groups, responding to each other's original writing (i.e. giving peer feedback).
   4. Guest speakers give presentations, followed by a discussion period.

B. School Year Inservices: Selected Teacher Consultants from the Summer Invitational Program coordinate inservices requested by local school districts. Each inservice varies in format and length, according to the individual needs of the district or school, with the standard model being ten meetings, each three hours long. BAWP central staff members and coordinators work

with district or school, with the standard model being ten meetings, each three hours long. BAWP central staff members and coordinators work with district administrators and teachers to assess needs of prospective inservice enrollees and to design a sequence of presentations selected from those made available by Teacher Consultants. Although there is no standard program content, certain topics which BAWP considers essential are included in most inservice programs (e.g. sentence writing techniques, peer feedback, holistic assessment, etc.).

The inservice process is as follows:

1. A range of specific approaches to the teaching of writing is presented by one to two guest speakers, selected from available Teacher Consultants, at each session. The presentation is followed by a fairly short discussion period.
2. Teachers do writing exercises which are given to them by guest speakers.
3. Teachers share original writing in small groups done both at home and during workshop meetings. The process involves peer feedback to writing.
4. Teachers are encouraged to implement BAWP approaches in their classes.
5. Some expert teachers are occasionally singled out at inservices to become Summer Invitational Fellows.

V. MONITORING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

A. Of Summer Invitational: In addition to ongoing advice provided by the central staff concerning inservices or other programs in which Teacher Consultants and Summer Invitational participants are invited to monthly Saturday meetings (hearing presentations on the teaching of composition, or discussing student writing, or other relevant issues) and receive the local newsletter.

B. Of Inservices: consists almost entirely of central staff filling subsequent requests for materials or other information made by inservice participants. Coordinators and Teacher Consultants have been called upon repeatedly for advice and, when time allows, for classroom observations.

VI. REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS

A. Impact on participants: Data from both the 1977-78 Teacher Inservice Report and the 1979 Long Term Follow-up Report indicate that BAWP inservices are the best that teachers have taken.

B. Impact on students

1. Holistic writing assessments on participants; students compared to a control group have produced mixed results in terms of significant student gains. NWP sites, however, report statistically significant impact on students.
2. Student attitude surveys indicate significant positive gains in attitude towards writing.

C. Long Term Follow-up: see 1979 Long Term Follow-up Report and VI-A (Impact on Participants)

D. Cost: see Cost Report

E. Other evaluation data: see Executive Summary

C.1. COMPOSITION INSERVICES

I. PROJECT LITERACY, Huntington Beach Union High School District, Huntington Beach, California, Dr. Richard Altimari, Project Director.

II. SCOPE:

A. Number of Participants: the Project is designed for ninth grade teachers in the district. A "cadre" of approximately 18 have been trained (by Ross Winterowd of University of Southern California's Department of Rhetoric and other consultants **). This group instructs most of the district's ninth grade students.

B. In addition, this cadre of teachers has begun providing inservice training for other teachers in the district--both in English and in other subject areas. The first sessions, consisting of one-day writing workshops, reached approximately 120 teachers in the spring of 1979. This workshop merely introduced the teachers to the concepts of the program. More in-depth inservices lasting one to two days will be held in the 1979 - 1980 school year.

C. A second type of training experience has also begun to result from this program. Participants have been asked to give presentations to other school districts, and a few of these were made during the 1978 - 1979 school year. (The exact number could not be determined. The Project has been supported with a Title IV C Development Grant and plans to apply for a IV C Dissemination Grant which would make the Project available across the state.

III. CONTENT:

A. Teachers' knowledge about writing is changed through a course based on a rhetorical approach to composition instruction, which supposedly would affect their teaching behaviors. Winterowd believes that there are specific works from research and rhetorical theory which must be learned and mastered by English teachers before they can become competent teachers of writing. The "discipline of writing" then includes both the mate[illegible]ch * studies) to be mastered and the experience of doing so wi[illegible] professionals. This philosophy differs markedly from BAWP [illegible] experienced teachers as authorities. (Skilled teachers share their techn[illegible]ques with peers, drawing upon research and theory when needed to enrich their presentation.) Works which are studied include Winterowd's survey of rhetorical theory and practice, (Contemporary Rhetoric: A Conceptual Background with Readings), James Britton's The Development of Writing Ability, Ages 11-18, William Labov's The Study of Nonstandard English, Frank O'Hare's Sentence Combining, and Walter Loban's Language and Development, K-12.

* Wherever important in the program descriptions, specific contrasts will be made with the BAWP model and marked with an *.

** Some of these teachers also attended the South Basin Writing Project 1978 Summer Institute. (The Institute was in fact "hosted" by Huntington Beach Schools; they provided facilities for meetings and some other resources. In addition they paid teachers from their own district who attended.) Thus, although this Project does offer some alternative program features to NWP sites, it also has been influenced by them.

B. The thrust of the program is to provide a more individualized approach to the teaching of writing than might be possible for teachers to design alone. A major effort has been made to develop materials which can be used in groups or individually which instruct students on the writing process (including prewriting, peer feedback, and rewriting as well as more technical aspects of
* editing and correction of errors. In this approach, the program parallels BAWP which teaches aspects of the writing process and emphasizes the importance of learning it over learning technical correctness. BAWP does not separate the two aspects of writing, nor does it give them equal weight. The Huntington Beach Project sees technical skills as important, but to be handled on an individualized basis through a remedial "editing laboratory".

IV. PROCESS

A. The seminar: Teachers voluntarily enroll in a semester-long seminar led by Dr. Winterowd which meets three hours per week for approximately 18 weeks, during the regular school year. The original seminars were taught by Winterowd; now they are led by students from his first seminars. Discussions include not only the works listed above, but also reports from classroom teachers on their
* own classroom practices. This latter feature resembles a main feature of the BAWP Summer Invitational and school year inservices with Teacher Consultants making presentation.

B. The only specific instructional approach that is taught at every seminar relates to the organization of writing activities. Winterowd believes that writing should take place in two different "scenes": the workshop (where students engage in a variety of exploratory exercises, pre-writing, revising, peer feedback, etc.) and the laboratory (where students work on specific skills which need remediation, e.g. correct grammar and usage, paragraph organization, etc.). Teachers are expected to provide such "scenes" in a manner appropriate for their school environment -- setting up a separate room for the laboratory if possible, or, if restricted in available space, setting up different areas within their own classroom or alternating scenes on different days.

V. MONITORING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION: Dr. Winterowd remains available to the teachers in his project for additional consulting, discussion, or meetings
* if requested. BAWP central staff and Teacher Consultants similarly are available for follow-up requests for materials or advice.

VI. REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS:

A. Impact on participants: no formal report exists at this time; informal reports from participants and observors indicate that the number of project participants is growing as are requests for training from other districts.

B. Impact on students: pre/post writing samples were given to all ninth graders in the district during the 1977-78 school year and the 1976-77 school year. No comparison groups were established. The same topic was used pre-post in both years. Students' adjusted gain scores were positive both years: on a 6 point holistic scale, they were .45 in 1976-77 and 1.11 in 1977-78. Because the same topic was used both years, however, the validity of this assessment is called into question. (Rather than reflecting improvement in writing skills, the student gains may only indicate improved skill in taking a particular test.)

C. Long Term Follow-up: not available

D. Cost: The project was funded in 1976-77 with a few thousand dollars to provide Dr. Winterowd's seminar and a writing assessment. In 1977-78 the district received a Ttile IV C grant which totalled $93,887 for a three-year period.

I. FAIRFAX EXPRESSIVE WRITING IN SCHOOL (1977-1978) (ESEA Title IV-C Innovative Project)

II. SCOPE:

A. 17 teachers of varying backgrounds

B. Several multi-graded elementary classes and an educationally handicapped class from four elementary schools (K-8) in Fairfax, California

III. CONTENT: involved improving teaching performance by changing participants' knowledge of materials and techniques used for composition instruction within a workshop setting, by demonstrating desired teaching behaviors through modelling and co-teaching in participants' classes, and by discussing program implementation.

IV. PROCESS: A needs assessment was conducted through surveying teachers and from a collection of student writing samples to determine the project design. The following training process was conducted over a school year with ten day-long workshops:

A. The workshop created a setting for in-depth discussion, presentations of lessons, strategies and goals.

B. The project staff met on a regular basis with individual participants in order to help develop assignments and units and plan the
* application of the strategies. In contrast, BAWP guest speakers (Teacher Consultants) present methods or approaches for teaching composition to participants, which they in turn can implement in their classes. However, the BAWP inservice process does not include individual consultation with participants, either for planning individual instructional units or monitoring progress.

C. A member of the project staff visited each participant's class at
* least once a week to model or co-teach. BAWP inservices rarely include visitation of participants' classes.

D. Project staff developed and presented 12 "idea sheets" for writing
* instruction which were given to participants. Similarly, BAWP Teacher Consultants often provide materials with their presentations.

V. Monitoring Program Implementation: Project staff met regularly with individual participants to review student work and discuss progress in the classroom program.

VI. REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS:

A. Impact on Participants:

1. Criterion referenced test was given to participants (n=15) on workshop ideas and techniques, and all participants scored 85% or above correct.

2. Project teachers were given a survey in December, 1977 in which they rated workshop activities on a scale of 1-4 (1 being most helpful and 4 being least helpful). The activities receiving the highest ratings (1 or 2) by the largest number of respondents (n=15) were:

a. Co-teaching (n=14)
b. Idea sheets (specific writing ideas) (n=14)
c. Informal discussion of strategies (n=13)
d. Open discussion with other teachers (n=12)
e. Journal (n=12)

3. Participants filled out an Activity Survey on 59 classroom activities for a week in May, 1978. Eleven classrooms of project participants were observed and rated during a different week in May, using the same activity survey participants have used. Data from some of the Fairfax * activities which BAWP emphasizes are listed below. In one column are percentages of teachers reporting "yes" on the activity survey. The other column represents the classroom observers' ratings of teacher activities in percentages.

Activity Survey Questions	Self-Report % of Teachers (n=16)	Observers' % of classes (n=11)
a. Gave written or oral feedback to ½ the students	100	100
+ b. Did writing along with students	31	9
c. Had students help each other revise + papers	38	36
+ d. Displayed or mimeographed student work	88	82
e. Whole class listened to other students' writing	81	82
+ f. Had students read work to each other	75	55
+ g. Gave guidance on paper revisions	63	36
+ h. Had students write stories	94	55
+ i. Had students write journal entries	13	36
+ j. Had students do personal writing	38	55
k. Helped students write with an authentic + voice	81	55
l. Had students write in social studies or + science	31	9
m. Helped students in the use of detail + (showing not telling)	50	45
n. Had students work on expressive writing + 2½ hours during the week	88	100
o. Students knew when and where to put + papers	100	64

B. Impact on Students:

1. A holistic writing assessment was conducted to compare participants' students to a matched control group. The topic for both the pre and post-assessment was "Imagine you are a box and describe yourself to a friend." The program students were significantly superior to the comparison group (at the .01 level).
2. Pre and post-CTBS scores recorded no significant gains for either group.
3. A pre and post-attitude survey was given to project and comparison students to determine how they felt about the sample written for the holistic assessment. Changes in affect were negligible for both groups.
4. A general attitude survey was administered to both groups to determine "most liked activity" and "least liked activity." Recess and drawing were liked best by all students, and grammar and book reports were liked least.

+ Although discrepancies between self-report and observors' report could be primarily due to differences in program content from week to week, they could also be an example of the inaccuracy of teacher self-report. (This has been a frequent finding in other research studies.)

4. According to the project staff, the journal of student writing, Wild Hair Is On My Head, was well received by students, teachers, parents, and the community. Project teachers reported that 56% of their students had used the journal.

C. Long Term Follow-up: not available

D. Cost: Title IVC funded the project for two years of development work for the following amounts: $73,292 (first year) and $73,965 (for the second year). See The Cost Report for a more detailed comparison of the Fairfax Project to BAWP.

C.2. OTHER INSERVICES

I. The Minicourse as a Vehicle for Changing Teacher Behavior, The Research Evidence (ED 029 809) 1969

II. SCOPE:
A. 48 elementary school teachers (grades 4,5,6)
B. Half the teachers were drawn from schools serving predominantly working-class communities, and half were drawn from predominantly middle-class communities.

III. CONTENT: involved changing teacher behavior by providing models of desired behavior, opportunities to practice and to evaluate practice using videotape. This course was designed to change attitudes and skills.

IV. PROCESS: the prototype of the minicourse was developed in 1967 and 1968 by the staff of the Teacher Education Program at Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Berkeley, California, directed by Walter Borg. Research on microteaching conducted by Robert Bush, Director of the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, served as the foundation of the minicourse model.

A minicourse is an auto-instructional package taking three days for completion. Numerous minicourses have been made which cover a variety of subject areas. This particular minicourse (#1) focused on improving teachers' use of questions in discussion, and the following process is the model for all minicourses (see footnote).

The participant:
A. reads the teacher handbook
B. views the instructional videotape
C. views model film
D. plans classroom lesson
E. microteaches a lesson with 5-15 students

V. MONITORING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION: The participant's lesson is videotaped, and the teacher then:
A. views replay of microteaching session
B. replans lesson
C. reteaches lesson
D. views reteach replay immediately after lesson
E. evaluates his/her progress

* This process, unlike BAWP's, involves self-instruction, self-observation through videotape feedback, and self-evaluation.

VI. REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS:
A. Impact on Participants: (n=48)
1. Teachers were pre and post-videotaped in class and rated by U.C. Berkeley graduate students who were trained as raters. Inter-rater reliability ranged from .60 to .98 for the different skills observed. Participants at all grade levels (4,5,6) demonstrated a reduction of half the original level of teacher talk, a major aim of the program. (from 51.64% to 27.75%, signicant at the .001 level).
2. Teachers made gains on 10 of the 12 skills taught.
3. Teachers increased asking students higher cognitive questions from 37.3% to 52% (of total questions asked).
4. Participants from working class communities showed greater gains than those from middle class areas.

B. Impact on Students: based on five minute pre and post-videotape samples, the length of student response (measured by the number of words) doubled from a pre-test mean of 5.63 to a post-test mean of 11.78, significant at the .001 level.

C. Long Term Follow-Up: two months after completion of the course, a refresher course was given to one third of the original group. Results showed no significant gains between this group and the rest of the sample, suggesting that the teachers had retained most of the skills acquired in the minicourse without a refresher course.

D. Cost: not available

(additional information on the minicourse process was taken from Walter Borg's The Minicourse (MacMillan Educational Services, Inc.: Beverly Hills) 1970.)

I. Individualized Inservice Training (EJ110 970) 1975

II. SCOPE:

A. Required for all new teachers of all subject areas at the elementary, intermediate and secondary levels. Established teachers were
* admitted upon request. BAWP training is usually voluntary, but some districts are more rigid in their requirement for attendance.

B. Delaware City Schools, Delaware, Ohio

III. CONTENT: focused on changing teacher behavior by aiding teachers in self-improvement techniques and by providing the opportunity to practice self-evaluation through the use of videotape.

IV. PROCESS: this program is a modification of the Inservice Strategy Model for Modifying Teacher Behavior, developed by the Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory (MOREL). The following 12 week training process is not sequential because the steps overlap.

A. Groups consisted of 10-12 teachers of the same grade level which met with an inservice training leader. Grouping according to grade
* level differs from BAWP practice where teachers often meet with mixed grade levels.

During four hours of the sessions teachers developed "self-awareness" by learning the Flanders Verbal Interaction Analysis System. This technique enabled teachers to analyze their interaction with their students during class and through videtapes taken of their teaching. The MOREL model emphasizes that the majority of teachers can be trained to direct their own improvement, especially through self-evaluation of videotaped sessions. The evaluator of the program believes that the
* resultant changes are likely to be more permanent. In contrast, BAWP attempts to improve teaching performance by introducing various new theories and writing techniques which the teachers must try themselves. The MOREL model directs teacher self-improvement through a particular strategy for self-observation and evaluation of performance in class. The BAWP process does not include this strategy.

B. Teachers set goals for themselves for improving their teaching performance with the aid of the inservice training leader according to their individual needs. The setting of goals usually evolves from
* the development of "self-awareness." BAWP does not create a particular inservice around individual teacher needs, rather, it assesses over-all district needs and designs individual inservices in coordination with district teachers and administrators. The program is intended to stimulate teachers to assess their own needs, while providing a number of solutions for them to choose among.

C. Teachers implement their plans for improvement through practice within their classrooms to achieve their individual goals for change.
* BAWP inservice participants are encouraged to change teaching strategies and implement workshop techniques, but without necessarily establishing clear plans for self-improvement.

D. Self-evaluation was a continuous and essential process of the program which involved interaction analysis of 6-9 videotaped class sessions of 15-20 minutes each. Individual teachers met with the training leader
* to discuss the tapes of class sessions. The BAWP inservice process does not include assessments of individual growth by the participant or by the workshop leader. However, Teacher Consultants' presentations are individually evaluated by their peers and by BAWP staff.

V. MONITORING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION: The major focus of this project is the continous process of monitoring teaching performance through self-evaluation.

VI. REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS:

A. Impact on Participants:

1. The evaluator claims that the program does not threaten teachers because they evaluate themselves with the aid of the inservice leader; some teachers shared tapes with one another if they desired to do so. The program was free from administrative evaluation.

2. A questionnaire was administered to 89 participants to determine program effectiveness and participants, like those in BAWP, felt a strong increase in their efficacy as a result of the training process.

a. 49 out of 56 felt the inservice had influenced their effectiveness as a teacher; seven were undecided.

b. 45 felt they gained more confidence in teaching ability, while six felt they did not, and nine were undecided.

c. 52 agreed that since learning interaction analysis, they had tried to stimulate student response, three didn't agree and five were undecided.

B. Impact on Students:

1. Students tried to perform better knowing that they were being videotaped.

2. Teachers often let students view tapes, and they developed a better sense of their own contributions and growth.

3. 23 teachers surveyed on the questionnaire noticed an improvement in student behavior due to teacher training, 13 did not and 22 were undecided.

C. Long Term Follow-Up: not available

D. Cost: not available

I. Purdue Interactive Television Colloquium Series: Continuing Career Education via IHETS Television Network (ED 144 335) 1971-1973

II. SCOPE:

A. 517 participants

B. 16 reception centers broadcasted video-tape presentations throughout the state of Indiana. Broadcast centers were close enough to bordering states to allow participants from Kentucky, Illinois, Michigan and Ohio as well as those from Indiana to take part in the training
* sessions. As in BAWP's inservices in the schools, participants from the more remote areas were reached through the program.

C. The ultimate number of persons reached through advertisement of the vide-tapes amounted to an additional 15,000 contact hours of instruction. (i.e. estimated course time=12 hours, estimated total viewers= 1,250 additional participants)

III. CONTENT: focused on changing participants' practical and theoretical knowledge of the communicatively handicapped, which would supposedly affect their professional behavior.

IV. PROCESS:

Specialists of communicative disorders presented 75 minute lectures through videotape television. These presentations were recorded live for future instructional use. This approach differs radically from
* BAWP's in that Teacher Consultants often present essentially the same material again and again at various inservices because BAWP does not videotape presentations for future use, believing that live interaction between speaker and audience is an essential aspect of their training.

The speaker's presentation was followed by a five minute discussion period at each of the 16 centers to gather questions for the presentor. The telecast resumed with 40 minutes of discussion, answering of questions, and a practical demonstration session through the use of the "talk-back system." This process is known as multi-point interactive T.V. This feature allows some of the benefits of audience speaker interaction, but obviously doesn't encourage the spontaneous or ex-
* tended interchanges possible in the BAWP inservice model.

V. MONITORING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION: not available

VI. REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS:

A. Impact on Participants: 337 participants returned a questionnaire on the T.V. series. Some of the results were as follows:

1. Topics were rated as excellent by 82%, as poor by 0%.
2. In an overall rating of the series, 94% were satisfied or very satisfied.

B. Impact on Students: not available

C. Long Term Follow-Up: not available

D. Cost: The program cost 73c per hour for 12,408 student contact hours.

I. Diffusion of the New Elementary School Science: An Assessment of One Model (EJ 064 727) 1972

II. SCOPE:

A. Teacher inservice training affected 60% of Colorado's elementary student population.

B. Any school district in Colorado which requested teacher training was offered an inservice. Eighteen of the 181 school districts had inservices, which included most of the largest districts and some of the small remote districts.

III. CONTENT: involved changing teacher performance using a research and development cycle to try out and revise a new curricular program (Colorado Elementary Science Project).

IV. PROCESS:

A. A small group of elementary school teachers were trained in the use of a new curricular program over one school year. During this year these teachers used the new materials with their students.

B. After the year long session, a two week summer session followed in which the same teachers were prepared to instruct other elementary school teachers about CESP's new curricular program.

* This program differs from BAWP in that Teacher Consultants are trained in a five week summer session prior to the school year. They are selected as "expert teachers" being trained to run inservice programs on the basis of their past experience.

C. After the summer session, these CESP teachers taught a three hour semester course which was the key to the dissemenation of the new

* curricular program, much as the BAWP Teacher Consultants run inservices for teachers in the schools.

D. All the CESP teacher trainers become resource leaders and act as educational decision makers within their particular schools. Unlike CESP teachers, not all BAWP summer invitational participants conduct inservices or become guest speakers at BAWP inservices. Each Teacher Consultant's position within his/her own school district varies. Some are accepted as consultants, decision makers, and leaders, especially if the school or district implements BAWP ideas, or makes inservices available for all of the staff. Other Teacher Consultants receive little if any recognition and support from the school or district.

V. MONITORING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION: Participants worked extensively with the new materials in their classes, and returned to the course

* with observations and questions about their experience. BAWP inservice participants are encouraged to use the workshop techniques in their own classrooms. and usually are given new materials each inservice meeting, rather than encouraged to discuss problems and experiences they have had in implementing the new teaching techniques. BAWP Teacher Consultants do have regular meetings one Saturday each month to discuss issues relevant to the teaching of writing, but not necissarily to a specific training experience.

The CESP instructors visited the classrooms of the teacher-participants to be able to discuss observable problems and successes, whereas BAWP participants are rarely observed in class. Along with live observation, the CESP program employed videotaping as a means of teacher-performance analysis. BAWP rarely uses this technique.

VI. REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS:

A. Impact on Participants: program staff gathered evaluation questions through informal discussions with members of the school district, University professors and Department of Education personnel, and through observation of the program.

1. A questionnaire was given to participants to determine the extent which teachers used the new materials extensively. Out of 413 participants, 47% agreed or strongly agreed they used the materials extensively, while 38% disagreed or strongly disagreed.
2. The questionnaire was phrased differently the following year. Participants were asked if they were presently using the new materials, and out of 149 participants, 73% stated they were using the materials. Also, 29% stated they were spending more time on science.
3. Through observation of teaching and the use of the Teaching Strategies Differential, 28 teachers were pre-tested to determine teaching style; 28 different teachers were selected for the post-test so there would be no possibility of a pre-test-treatment interaction effect. Participants showed significant gains at the .01 level. The pre-mean score was 4.98, and the post-mean score was 5.64. The scale ranged from 1 to 8, where 1 represented expository-direct and 8 represented inductive-direct.

B. Impact on Students: not available

C. Long Term Follow-up: Eight of ten districts surveyed (representing 92% of the student population) had established the goal of placing the new program in all of the district's classrooms. The other two districts were implementing CESP in some of their classrooms and were attempting to expand the number of teachers using the new curricular program.

D. Cost: annual expenditure for each district ranged from $1,200 to $17,500. Funds were available from a $100,000 N.S.F. grant. The average district expenditure was $8,700.

E. Other Evaluation Data:

1. Telephone interviews were conducted with participants, school administrators, and program staff to determine the major criticisms of the program. These interviews revealed the lack of science equipment was the major constraint of the program.
2. Principals were visited to determine their opinions of CESP, its implementation, and their involvement with the program. It was determined that they were marginally involved. During the second year of the program, districts were encouraged to provide inservices for principals or ask them to attend some teacher training sessions. Districts doing this reported that they had found it very worthwhile.

I. Teacher Training and Program Development in Motor Education for Handicapped Children in New York City Elementary Schools (ED 136-491) 1974-1976

II. SCOPE:
A. 178 teachers of 1,002 handicapped students
B. New York City elementary schools

III. CONTENT: involved improving teacher performance through in-class observation of expert teachers, workshop sessions, and videotaped teaching demonstrations, which would in turn change attitudes and knowledge of concepts and techniques.

IV. PROCESS:
A. Classes of handicapped pupils and their teachers attended two training sessions per week throughout a school year which were conducted by project resource specialists. During these sessions the pupils' teachers observed and assisted the specialists in the implementation of a specially designed motor education curriculum. Specialists demonstrated how to upgrade pupil motivation and self-confidence through success experience and to reinforce basic cognitive concepts through the students' motor learning. The BAWP process does not include in-class observation or implementation of theories and techniques as a means of teacher training. Several BAWP and National Writing Project participants made the criticism that they felt a strong need to observe a BAWP trained teacher in the classroom to better understand the application of BAWP techniques.
B. Participants attended periodic training workshops in addition to in-class learning.
C. Videotapes of teaching demonstrations were made for teachers' use.
D. Parent education was another component of the program and was accomplished through:
1. demonstration workshops
2. instructional materials

* BAWP encourages teachers to have their students share their writing with their parents, but parents are not actually instructed in how to help their children.

V. MONITORING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION: A master teacher provided regular supervision by visiting specialists' classes and discussing program implementation with them. The specialists also visited one another's classrooms during the second year of the project to compare and learn new methods. BAWP participants and guest speakers present their techniques to one another during the Summer Invitational sessions, but rarely do they make visits to other Teacher Consultants' classes to compare or improve methods.

Participating teachers were visited and observed by specialists the following school year to 'maximize carry-over of training into the classrooms." Further provision of follow-up assistance to teachers included the distribution of regular lesson plans for motor education.

* The BAWP process, on the other hand, rarely includes use of in-class teacher observation. Several BAWP participants expressed a strong desire for such a follow-up on the 1979 BAWP survey, and many National Writing Project participants stated the same desire on evaluation forms. Field studies have shown that the major criticism of BAWP in the two districts where interviews were conducted is the lack of a follow-up observation, especially for inservice participants.

VI. REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS:
A. Impact on Participants: teachers (n=96) were given a pre and

post questionnaire to reveal their understanding of knowledge, methods and problems involving motor education of handicapped students. Teachers exhibited a 100% gain on the post-questionnaire.

B. Impact on Students: students increased their scores on the Motor Proficiency Screening Test by 75% from pre to post-testing.

C. Long Term Follow-Up: not available

D. Cost: not available

E. Other Evaluation Data: parents of the students were administered a questionnaire to determine the extent to which they were favorably impressed with their children's progress. 100% responded favorably.

I. Evaluation of an Inservice Program for Earth Science Teachers (EJ 121 536) 1969-1971

II. SCOPE:
A. 32 secondary school teachers
B. Five school districts in Ohio

III. CONTENT: involved changing teaching performance by using a research and development cycle through pilot classes to try out and revise a new curriculum.

IV. PROCESS:
A. During a summer workshop, teachers were trained five days a week, all day for four weeks in earth science content, and informal discussions were held during and after lab sessions. Like BAWP Summer Invitational participants, teachers presented lectures. Teachers went on field trips, used the Geology department's audio-tutorial laboratory, and had the
* opportunity to review various films and other A.V. aids. BAWP training takes place mainly within the workshop.
B. During the inservice phase the following school year, 20 teachers conducted pilot classes using workshop materials exclusively. The remaining 12 teachers used their traditional texts, but could use activities and content from the workshops. All 32 participants were given one hour of release time each week to observe the pilot teachers. Inter-class obser-
* vation of in-class implementation of workshop techniques are not BAWP training components.
C. Participants met with representatives from Ohio State University to review the progress of pilot classes. Discussions centered around the appropriateness of materials, techniques, and concepts for particular grade levels, ability levels, and socio-economic groups. This training
* component differs from BAWP because teachers were able to discuss the appropriateness of their training after direct experience in or observation of classes.
D. The second year of the program, 20 of the original 32 participants returned to Ohio State to participate in a six week summer session. This session was designed to:
1. improve teachers' understanding of earth science;
2. aid teachers in developing earth science instructional units for their schools; each teacher received a full set of these units;
3. allow teachers to form groups to discuss their experiences from pilot classes and develop a course of study for their classes.

* Like BAWP participants, teachers leave training with many new techniques which they learned from fellow participants and guest speakers. They, too, are encouraged to share ideas with other teachers. BAWP inservice participants, however, do not produce a set of instructional units to present to other teachers.

After the implementation of the new earth science program in the schools the following year, participants of the training session attended a monthly four hour meeting to discuss the implementation problems and
* to analyze videotapes of their teaching performance. BAWP Teacher Consultants have a similar four hour monthly meeting with the exception of the videotape analysis.

V. MONITORING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION: The process of this project involves continuous monitoring of program implementation.

VI. REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS:

A. Impact on Participants:

1. Teachers evaluated themselves through video-feedback of classroom teaching. Teachers met with staff once a month to discuss and analyze the tapes through a technique learned at the workshop. BAWP doesn't include the use of video-feedback or self-evaluation as a part of the training process, although summer invitational participants now offer evaluation and suggestions for each teacher's presentation.

2. Participants (n=28) were pre and post-tested for factual and conceptual knowledge and showed significant gains from a pre-test mean score of 26.59 to a post-test mean of 56.89

3. Teachers who participated in both years of the program exhibited greater gains than those who only took one training session.

B. Impact on Students: students of 24 teachers were pre and post-tested on factual, conceptual, and affective information, although there was no control group to show expected gains;

1. Students showed significant gains on factual knowledge . The pre-mean test score was 26.59 and the post mean score was 29.65.

2. Gains in theoretical knowledge were positive, but they weren't significant. The pre-mean score was 18.59 and the post-mean score was 19.16.

3. Students' perceptions of teachers' use of methods and techniques were tested, and gains were significant from a pre-mean score of 6.73 to a post-mean score of 7.78. The test was called the Science Classroom Activity Checklist: Student Perceptions (SCACL:SP), and was designed to reveal students' perceptions of their teachers' implementation of training techniques.

C. Long Term Follow-Up:

1. In 1972, a year after the program was completed, the SCACL:SP test was again administered to participants' students. The follow-up test showed that students' perceptions of their teachers' were essentially the same as they had reported on the post-test in 1971.

2. Teachers were also re-tested in 1972 on factual and theoretical knowledge and analyses revealed no significant change from the 1971 post-test scores,

D. Cost: not available

E. Other Evaluation Data: in 1970-71 most participating districts implemented the revised earth science course based on this program, and the remaining districts implemented a pilot course which was permanently implemented the following year.

D. COMPOSITION PROGRAMS

I. Links to Effective Writing, a two volume series by Anne Obenchain of Reston, Virginia (published by Validated Writing Systems, Reston, VA)

II. Scope: the program has been in use for all ninth and tenth grade students since 1971 at Langley High School in Reston, VA. In addition, approximately 16,000 copies have been distributed by the author on request since 1971. The series also includes a Teacher's Guide and a book of student exercises (Keys).

III. Content: A highly-structured reading-writing program which employs the technique of sentence combining in teaching students specific sentence patterns related in their content to reading assignments. Students move *from writing sentences to composing themes. Although BAWP inservices often include demonstration of sentence combining, they do not espouse a program based exclusively on that practice.

IV. Process: This program was developed by an individual classroom teacher and is presently being disseminated via the materials which she created. She has received only one request to give a workshop to date, and almost no inquiries suggesting problems with use of the texts. ("The materials *are self-explanatory if the teachers read," she believes.) As of the fall of 1979 BAWP will be offering a variety of booklets, many of them on successful techniques used by teachers in the project.

V. Monitoring Program Implementation: there are no measures to do this

VI. Reported Effectiveness: In a quasi-experimental design, Obenchain found that students trained in her program were rated more skillful in writing paragraphs than students in a comparison group, given certain sentences of information to work with. No evaluation data on teacher impact exists.

Cost: $13.00 for the two volumes; the Teacher's Guide is free with class sets and costs $15.00 separately; Keys costs $4.00

I. Vista Writing Program, developed by Dr. Harry Hulls, Department of Education, California State University at San Diego

II. SCOPE:
A. Five teachers and approximately 150 students per year within a single school district
B. High schools in Vista, California

III. CONTENT: involves changing teacher performance through the introduction of a tightly structured writing skills program, including observation and feedback of participants' classroom performance.

IV. PROCESS: This highly structured year long program was originally designed for low achieving 10-12 th grade students. Materials were developed by two of the participating teachers in consultation with Dr. Harry Hulls.

Teachers begin this skills oriented program with their students by having them do exercises in writing sentences (simple, compound, and complex), moving to paragraph writing, and concluding with compositions of several paragraphs.

* This program sounds somewhat similar to some run by BAWP Teacher Consultants (e.g. Jerry Herman) in the degree of structuring and gearing of materials to low ability students. However, it does not represent the BAWP inservice model which makes a variety of resources (materials, techniques, theories) available for teachers to use with students of varying ability and skill levels.

V. MONITORING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION: Dr. Hulls has been available as an overseer and consultant throughout the three year period, and was available for additional assistance when the teachers requested it. He also attended at least two class sessions of participating teachers each month. There were staff meetings involving discussion of program implementation. None of the BAWP staff, to date, have been involved in such a close tutorial effort. In some cases, coordinators or BAWP presentors have been able to do follow-up observations in the classrooms of participants, but this is rarely done.

VI. REPORTED EFFECTIVENESS:
A. Impact on Participants: not available
B. Impact on Students: 1) In a matched pairs, quasi-experimental design, Dr. Hulls found that students in his program gained from 2-3.4 years in written expression and written mechanics on the CTBS
2) Project students scored significantly higher than comparison students on holistically scored essays from the pre to post-test. (This data is in the process of being summarized and is to be submitted to the California Title IVC office.
C. Cost: this project was supported over three years by a Title IV-C development grant. At this point, the number of students served is quite small (estimated at 450).

E. CONCLUSION

Scope

In terms of numbers of participants reached through dissemination, BAWP stands unequalled in the field of English inservice education and is at least a leading contender in all inservice education. Beginning as a local movement, it has grown in a relatively short time (5 years) to unparalleled local and national scope. In numbers of teachers trained (both locally and in its offshoot, the National Writing Project) it exceeds all of the critical competitors mentioned here with the possible exception of the Colorado Elementary Science Program (CESP).

The question of whether BAWP is expending its greatest time and effort on aspects of writing instruction least likely to influence inservice participants can be considered in light of the practices of the critical competitors. The inservice programs in composition (e.g. Obenchain's Links, Vista) and in other subject areas (e.g. Motor Education, CESP, etc.) with less ambitious goals and program content more limited to practical teaching strategies, do report positive impact using evaluation measures other than teacher self-report. Those programs however, whose goals and subject matter are as complex as BAWP's (e.g. Huntington Beach and Fairfax) lack valid measures of student and teacher impact. The trade-off of measurable gains vs. meaningful, ambitious content may not be inescapable (See discussion of "Reported Effectiveness" below).

Process

BAWP's accomplishments in a third area, the training process, reveal a number of strong features. The project continues to be an extremely

effective delivery system for the most promising practices in composition, a uniquely successful design for ongoing development of inservice leaders and for incorporation of critical competitors or their best ideas, as soon as they are identified. In addition, certain features built into the process (teachers as leaders, learning by doing, etc.) repeatedly gain enthusiastic response from participants (an impressive accomplishment in a hostile inservice environment). Finally, one feature which staff development specialists elsewhere (e.g. at a recent conference sponsored by NIE) are claiming as feasible and desirable in staff development programs is firmly built into the model — the collaboration between universities and local schools. BAWP gives such collaboration an imaginative alteration in its insistence on the classroom teacher as the expert and entrepreneur of other available resources (which include university researchers and theorists). The appeal of BAWP's dissemination effort to the 67 sites of the NWP attests to the strength of the model.

Amid such superlatives, qualifications may seem unwarranted. As noted before, however, BAWP's program succeeds within a specific inservice context. Further development of the project requires at once appreciating its accomplishments within that context and taking a broader view of its possibilities. BAWP has been responding to a relative lack of knowledge and information about best practices in teaching composition which may not last indefinitely. Likewise, its concern to address the broadest possible audience (with a resulting diverse program content) may need to be amended as the techniques it most frequently espouses become better known. For any number of reasons BAWP may want to consider the more focused refinement of a limited number of approaches or of more measurable classroom behaviors.

In part, their soon-to-be published booklets on a number of different techniques for teaching composition will help to spread some of their most promising practices to a larger audience. But BAWP leader Jim Gray still believes one strength of the Project to be its refusal to be restricted to a specific set of techniques. He continues to be interested both in discovering techniques and new inservice presentors. Thus it seems unlikely, given this orientation that BAWP would be inclined toward such a narrowing of offerings.

Several of the critical competitors surveyed here offer useful models of how this might be done. Collaborative planning between teachers and presentors (e.g. CESP, Fairfax, etc.) allows development and revision of materials and methods. Pilot testing methods with opportunities for discussion between participants and program designers and subsequent revision suggests another successful approach to more focused program development (e.g. Vista, Fairfax, Earth Science). None of the approaches used by the critical competitors is particularly novel; however, they do perform functions which are absent in any systematic fashion from the current BAWP model and for this reason are included here.

Another type of addition to BAWP's process and content concerns measures for encouraging program change. The impact of the school year inservices remains primarily at the level of the individual teacher and classroom. The Long Term Follow-up Report (pp. 25-27) found that few inservice teachers became involved in program planning or change as a result of their BAWP inservice experience. (This is hardly surprising because the inservice, unlike the Summer Invitational, is not designed to produce inservice leaders or change agents.) Although the BAWP process is highly effective in providing training for individual teachers, it

does not offer the basis for more widespread change. The Rand study, Implementation of Innovative Programs (Rand, 1978), found that involvement of staff from all levels of the school and district hierarchy seemed an important condition of those innovative programs that were continued after initial federal funding support stopped. BAWP might seek ways of bringing about this broader-based support. An example of a program which reaches beyond the classroom teacher is provided by the CESP program in which some school districts included school principals in inservices and reported that it was a worthwhile effort. (This tactic has been used by a few NWP sites.) Other strategies might include time in the inservice devoted to the topic of program change with Teacher Consultants brought in who could talk about widespread program impact. Another strategy would be to allow time for participants to discuss program change and lay groundwork for future planning meetings.

Monitoring Program Content

The question for evaluators may not be so much whether BAWP is bringing about change, but rather, whether it might do so more effectively and comprehensively by monitoring what it teaches in inservices. Enthusiastic response from participants is undeniably the first step in changing writing programs. But if BAWP inservice impact remains primarily at the level of individual classrooms with no way of ensuring correspondence among them, or fails to build in a more systematic method of follow-up of initial training, it may be ignoring a potential source of collective support essential for improvement of student writing. The lesson of those making extensive application of BAWP's best practices report that improvement in writing ability (as broadly defined by BAWP) is a slow, uneven process, taking place over several years' time, requiring not only the

coordination of English teachers' goals and practices, but the further support of teachers across the curriculum. If BAWP sought to include monitoring procedures as a regular feature of its inservice package, it might be able to extend collective concern and involvement of teachers and administrators beyond the end of its inservices.

The critical competitors offer a wide variety of procedures for monitoring program implementation. They include:

1) classroom observation by experts or by fellow participants (e.g. Motor Education, Diffusion of a New Elementary Science, etc.)

2) microteaching: modeling, tryout, and evaluation using videotape (e.g. The Minicourse)

3) individualized instruction promoting self-evaluation using videotape (e.g. Individualized Inservice Training)

4) co-teaching between participants and trainers (e.g. Fairfax)*

5) pilot teaching with program materials and collaboration and revision of them (e.g. Diffusion of a New Elementary Science)*

6) development of resource leaders who monitor implementation of a standard program package through in-class observation and videotaping (e.g. CESP)

7) ongoing discussion and collaboration of participants (e.g. Huntington Beach)

With careful planning and use, any of these techniques might aid BAWP in effecting consistent and successful use of techniques by individual teachers and developing more widespread collective concern for program implementation and success. The critical issue in the successful use of any of these techniques is whether BAWP leaders will be able to define specific practices and/or attitudes carefully enough so that their application in different classrooms can be monitored.

* BAWP staff and inservice participants tried this practice after one inservice.

Reported Effectiveness

Throughout the preceeding discussion, hypotheses have been advanced concerning the possible impact of various aspects of the BAWP model. For the sake of clarity certain major points will be summarized concerning effectiveness.

(1) BAWP will continue to be a difficult program to assess because of its lack of uniform program content across all inservices. Reported enthusiasm from its immediate clients, while making it one of the most successful inservice programs to date, should not be misconstrued as a final measure of effectiveness. It may be that fitting program content to local needs allows teachers to affirm their own sense of renewal and hope. This emotional impact (felt by most teachers in the program) is undeniably the first and most necessary ingredient for change, but by itself it it not sufficient to guarantee widespread improvement of writing instruction. The popularity of the BAWP program might also be rooted in the high ideals it espouses for composition teachers. BAWP's refusal to adopt a "cookbook" approach to composition inservice may be calling forth a spirit of inventiveness and a sense of responsibility from teachers which they have seldom experienced. To determine whether large numbers can rise to such a challenge of professional growth also requires more extensive evaluation efforts than possible at the present.

(2) Greater efforts should be made to develop means to monitor program implementation. It is important for BAWP to develop observation and measurement procedures so that they know how accurately and effectively teacher participants apply their training in the classroom. Several of the critical competitors provided examples of how this might be done.

(3) Appropriate tools for measuring the impact of the most frequently implemented BAWP techniques on students need to be developed. Use of such measures as special scoring guides for assessing rewriting attempts, or for evaluating revision advice given in peer feedback could be valuable for individual teachers in monitoring the success of their implementation of these techniques. Such analytic tools are also important for overall program assessment. This need seems particularly crucial because studies using holistic assessment (a technique currently used to measure writing progress) suggest that it may be difficult to find statistically significant results using holistic assessment alone. It is far easier for programs with more specific content (e.g. Obenchain, Vista) to support claims of impact on students; such programs will continue as appealing critical competitors until BAWP can demonstrate achievement of measurable student impact resulting from its more ambitious program content.